PLANNING COMMISSION
MEETING MINUTES
MONDAY, APRIL 11, 2016
6:00 P.M.

PLANNING COMMISSION MEMBERS: Chairperson Eric Woolridge, Vice-Chairperson Greg Simmons, Connor Boyle, Carolina Catoe, Michelle Dineen, Susan McCracken, Matthew Long, Charlie Myers, Jon Tate, Matthew Vincent and Jeff Templeton

PLANNING STAFF: Bill Bailey, Planning Director, Jane Shook, Planning Supervisor and Marlene Crosby, Board Secretary

---

Chair Woolridge called the meeting to order at 6:07 p.m.

ADOPTION OF AGENDA

Member Tate made a motion to accept the agenda as presented, seconded by Member Boyle.

VOTE:

Aye-All
Nay-None

The motion passes.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Member Tate made a motion to approve the January 6, 2016 Special Public Hearing minutes, seconded by Member Boyle.

VOTE:

Aye-All
Nay-None

The motion passes.

Member Boyle made a motion to approve the January 11, 2016 Planning Commission meeting minutes as amended with minor modifications made by Member Templeton, seconded by Member Tate.

VOTE:

Aye-All
Nay-None

The motion passes.

CASE 20150944 and 20150945 HAMPTON ESTATES

Chairperson Woolridge noted that this case has been withdrawn by the applicant on March 31, 2016.

CASE 20160136 RIVERS WALK:

Mr. Jeff Githens with McKinley Boone, LLC has filed a Zoning Map Amendment Petition for a planned development consisting of a mixed-use building containing both residential and commercial uses, including a parking deck for properties located at 178 South Water Street, 190 and 208 Poplar Grove Road. The building will contain 119 dwelling units with 380 bedrooms; with the following uses proposed to be allowed for the commercial portion of the building 11.06 Restaurant ≤ 2,500 ft2 open to the public during 10 pm – 6 am, 11.07 Other Restaurants ≤ 2,500 ft2, 11.08 Restaurant > 2,500 ft2 open to the public during 10 pm – 6 am, 11.09 Other Restaurants > 2,500 ft2, 11.12 Personal Service Establishment open to the public during 10 pm – 6 am, 11.13 Other Personal Service Establishments, 11.14 Retail Store up to 5,000 ft2, 11.15 Retail Store more than 5,000 but less than 25,000 ft2, 11.18 Business or Profession Office open to the public during 10 pm – 6 am, 11.19 Other Business or Professional Office, 11.23 Medical Office, Category 4, 12.10 Recreation Facility, Category 1, and 14.02 Brewpub.

Chairperson Woolridge opened the floor for discussion on this case. Mr. Bill Bailey, Director of Planning and Inspections Department informed the Planning Commission members that Member Boyle had requested to recuse himself from this case because he is professionally involved in the proposed project.

Member Templeton made a motion to recuse Member Boyle from this case, seconded by Member McCracken.

Vote:

Aye – All
Nay – None

The motion passed.

Member McCracken made a motion to open the public hearing to hear new information from the applicant, seconded by Member Tate.

VOTE:

Aye-All
Nay-None

The motion passes.

Mr. Jim Deal from Deal, Moseley and Smith representing the applicant introduced Mr. Jeff Githens from Peak Development, LLC to present additional information regarding the greenway connection to Water Street and the exterior appearance of the building.

Mr. Githens from Peak Development, LLC presented new information in a drawing and answered questions on it from the Planning Commission members. He said the drawing showed the "greenway connection to Water Street (permanently attached) is a follow-up to the dialog that was talked about at the special public hearing for this case.

Mr. Githens talked about meeting Chairperson Woolridge on site to discuss the greenway. He talked about the proposed location of the greenway. He said it will be entirely on the Rivers Walk property. He said he thinks he can keep the dumpsters in an area that is preferable to the property owners. He said the dumpsters are not all the way to the edge of the parking lot but still away from Water Street side of the surface lot. He said the area of the greenway that they are willing to construct stops at the parking garage. He said the easement and design still continues from that point to go around the parking garage, if there is ever an attempt to continue the greenway in the future. He said it would be considered in the flood study update unless there is deviation from it, it should be in good standing if the Town decides to continue the greenway to the county's property. Mr. Githens said this was the best alternative for the greenway because there were easements that would have needed to be obtained from surrounding property owners and a retaining wall was needed.

Member Long asked if the proposed greenway is paved from Water Street to the future area behind the parking deck. Mr. Githens said that was correct, the greenway stays on the Rivers Walk property.

Chairperson Woolridge asked Mr. Githens why his company is not willing to build the Greenway to the county's property line. Mr. Githens said they are not unwilling on his part and he talked about the original approval of the conditional district approval for this case and the anticipated easement being provided to the county without any greenway construction. He said he saw utility in the greenway being constructed as part of his contribution to the Town and he thought it made sense. They decided to include it as part of their construction budget and add to their parking deck. He said the remainder of the greenway construction depends on what goes on around the proposed project. He said because he did not know ultimately what might happen around the proposed project, it did not make a lot of sense for him to commit himself, when the future of the greenway was unknown. He said his offer is a better offer than the original Rivers Walk approval and it is a component of the greenway that will be used.

Commission Member Myers asked if at the end of the Rivers Walk greenway where the greenway pavement stops would the greenway be roped off so cyclists will not be able to continue to travel

on it. Mr. Githens said this area would be a landscaped area and he would not be inviting that scenario to happen.

Commission Member Templeton talked about the possibility of the exchange of extending the greenway for other things that could be decided on collectively that are being asked for. Mr. Githens said it was a fair request.

Mr. Githens talked about working cooperatively with the Town of Boone regarding the architectural appearance and the building materials. He talked about red brick. He suggested making a good faith effort to come up with what the exterior of the building should look like. He said that no one has told him definitively what that look is and it is difficult to know how to prepare for it.

Member McCracken asked for clarification on the hardy board building materials. Mr. Githens said he is open for discussion on the façade treatments and color scheme and he needs to know what the building materials should be.

Discussion ensued on the proposed windows for the building especially on the street level. Mr. Githens said the proposed plans comply with the window requirements on the primary and secondary streets.

Member McCracken asked if the percentage and distribution of the hardy board being proposed for this project in line with other projects and is more or less the same or different than the other buildings in the Downtown area. Chairperson Simmons said it is different from a medical district or in the B-3 zoning district.

Vice-Chairperson Simmons said he read the narrative for the current approval having five connected buildings with each a maximum of 40 feet high and how each building elevation is designed to replicate the character of Downtown Boone. He said the 32-37 building is a primary street. He said that Water Street will be composed of local rock and brick and will include the clock tower. He said that the 32-42, 32-52 and 32-62 buildings will composed of significant amounts of granite, local rock and brick with significantly tall commercial windows in the style of the 1900's. He said the 32-67 building will use concrete plank with exposed iron structure porch with decorative Victorian style rails. He said it might be useful to compare this approved information to the proposed plans for this proposed project.

Vice-Chairperson Simmons read about the four findings of the Planned Development process in the Unified Development Ordinance and he thought this should be a part of the discussion of this case because of the proposed deviation from the conditional district approval.

Mr. Bailey reminded the Planning Commission members that the conditional district zoning approval for this case controls this project. He said the design criteria controls unless this application specifically deviates from it. He continued to talk about the process for the possible deviations and mitigations in the proposed case.

Member McCracken asked the applicant why they want to change the project from the previous approval. Mr. Githens explained the reasons that were presented at the special public hearing. He further explained that the changes were made to help make this a better building than what was previously presented and approved.

Commission Member Templeton asked Mr. Githens to talk about the reason they moved the swimming pool and the benefit of moving it. Mr. Githens showed on a map the previous location of the pool which was near the current location of the proposed greenway and the creek. He said it was not much more than a lap pool due to the size of the area and they determined it was not in the best location. He said for a number of reasons, it was a better idea to put the pool on top of the parking deck. He talked about the elevation being 3,274 and 3,270 is above grade along Poplar Grove Road. He noted the existing grade is 3,250.

Chairperson Woolridge asked Staff for clarification about the process for making recommendations. Mr. Bailey explained the process.

Chairperson Woolridge asked if there was anyone from the public that wanted to speak on this case. There were no other speakers on this case.

Motion and Vote:
Member McCracken made a motion to close the public hearing, seconded by Commission Member Tate.

VOTE:

Aye – All
Nay- None

The motion passed.

Member McCracken talked about the change of 20 parking spaces being significant. She did not see much difference in the building height, she thought it was par with the street along Poplar Grove Road, she supported the proposed building height and said it would make it more attractive for retail space and housing space, she supported the relocation of the retail commercial space and she understood the need to possibly re-locate the dumpsters and location of the greenway. She

suggested that the Planning Commission members try to follow the previous approval and review any changes to it, when making recommendations.

Member Templeton asked Member McCracken how she felt about the change in the mix of units since she is familiar with the university housing. Vice-Chairperson Simmons noted there were five efficiencies, seven one-bedroom units, 39 two-bedroom units, three three-bedroom units and 72 four-bedroom units. Member McCracken said the efficiency or one-bedroom units are attractive to students. She questioned how attractive the three and four bedroom units would be to young professionals who might be working in the Downtown area or on campus. She said young professionals would not be interested in being in apartment complexes with the proposed mix of bedrooms.

Discussion ensued on the appropriate amount of bedrooms that work best in apartment complexes near the campus.

Member Long said that he agrees with Member McCracken's thoughts on the proposed project. He noted that this location is the lowest in elevation of any of the Downtown Boone and the property would support the proposed building height. He commended the developer on using the parapet wall to screen the mechanical equipment.

Member Templeton said that through the Planned Development process the applicant is allowed to make this a better project than previously approved. He said moving the commercial space down to Water Street makes perfect sense, he said the higher ceiling height in the commercial space makes perfect sense otherwise they are forced to build commercial space that would be unattractive to commercial tenants, therefore, he thinks this is an improvement. He liked the idea of having the elevator going to the third floor where everyone has access to it. He thinks the parapet is an improvement. He said the re-location of the pool is creating more livability space on the ground level and provides for the construction of the greenway which will benefit the whole community.

Member Templeton talked about the comments from the special public hearing for this case. He talked about the location of the project creating traffic, he said he found that comment to be counter intuitive. He said you would want your employees or students living close to the place of employment. He said he discounted that whole argument.

Member Templeton talked about the architectural style comments from the special public hearing for this case. He said he has seen the architectural style for the Downtown change over the years and he there is not an architectural style for the Downtown area. He said from his perspective, he does not see this project being a part of the B-1 zoning district architectural standards. He said the issue of noise was overstated. He said that Ms. Pam Williamson's comments on the developer not

being local and he thought that was a false argument. He said the developer had expressed his willingness to work with the Town on the appearance of the building as long as it doesn't add a burden of expense to the project.

Member Templeton talked about the clock tower and he thought it was a good proposed feature. He thought this would add to the Downtown area.

Member Myers talked about the dumpsters and their location near the Proper Restaurant. He talked about the façade of the building. He wanted the location of the dumpsters to be considerate to Proper Restaurant and the other businesses in the area. He talked about the proposed addition of the Kraut Creek cabbage scale informational area and the greenway being seen by restaurant patrons and other visitors using the greenway rather than the dumpsters.

Member Myers talked about location of the proposed project being a positive because of the walkability to the university and the Downtown area.

Member Vincent was concerned about the 16 parking spots being taken up with commercial retail and restaurant parking. He also noted that he did not see a proposed landscape plan in the information presented. He said that the does not have a concern with the hardy board building material, he just wanted to know if the applicant was open to using other building materials. He said he is not concerned with the building height.

Member Myers noted that a 3D rendering with topography would have been helpful for the Planning Commission members to review on this proposed project.

Member Tate said he supported the thoughts of the other commission members for this proposed project regarding the building height and the re-location of the pool. He has no other concerns regarding the change in the plans for this proposed project.

Member Dineen talked about the appearance of the buildings. She noted that she had heard from others in the community that they would like to see buildings that are more non-monolithic. She is concerned about a large project coming in and taking over the look that the Downtown area is trying to achieve. She did not show a concern for the building height. She believed that the proposed development would be for student housing and there is a need for this type of housing.

Member Catoe said her main concern was the proposed parking. She said the survey was taken by the students of which 40 percent of them live on campus. She said she felt that the survey was impacted by freshmen and sophomore students who naturally do not bring cars on campus. She said they have 164 parking spaces for 380 bedrooms and 21 spaces for commercial. She noted that the UDO would estimate five to twelve parking spaces per 1,000 square feet and they have two

spaces for 1,000 square feet, she doesn't think this is enough parking. She talked about the decrease in parking spots due to the two smart cars and zip car. She said that she sees a massive issue with parking in the Downtown area. She said she thinks the proposed project is going to hurt the Town more than help the Town. She talked about the building materials and she said that she did not like the cultural stone because she thinks it look cheap and it looks like it is a material that will not last ten years from now. She wanted to see more natural stone. She said she was discouraged that the proposed project is another student accommodation. She said it would be nice to see the proposed project have more single-bedroom units built into it.

Member McCracken talked about the decrease in parking spaces and compared it to the university parking.

Vice-Chairperson Simmons said the specific parking reductions were outlined in the parking demand study. He talked about the 74 percent of students having cars. He would like to know how the survey arrived at this percentage number and the population itself. He said what 74 percent of 380 beds is. He said if this calculation holds true, there could be 280 cars. Member Templeton said you cannot use just math to explain because the location needs to be considered.

Member McCracken left the meeting at 7:07 p.m.

Discussion ensued on not being able to compare the parking study in the meeting packet with a project the size of the Standard at Boone which is farther away from the proposed project which is right beside the campus. Member Long agreed that you cannot compare the parking study to the Cottages because they are farther away from the campus.

Discussion ensued on the decrease in parking and the need for parking in the Downtown area.

Chairperson Woolridge asked Member Catoe to further explain how the lack of parking being proposed with this project will make parking worse in the Downtown area. Member Catoe said she senses that students are using the metered parking incorrectly now in the Downtown area. She said when you add more students in another large development, it will clog our Downtown area and others will not have spaces to park in. Member Tate said he couldn't see a full-time resident trying to utilize a two-hour parking space. Member Tate said the idea of the project was to allow people to come to the Downtown without having a car. Member Tate said this could be seen as a positive because most people do not have to have a car from a parent's perspective.

Discussion ensued on metered parking.

Discussion ensued on the lack of visitor parking for the proposed parking on the project.

Discussion ensued on the ample parking for the commercial spaces.

Discussion ensued on the need for both residential and commercial parking spaces.

Mr. Bailey explained about what happens, if there is a change to the standards. Mr. Bailey said the applicant would have to identify the change, the standard and impacts and mitigations.

Member Templeton asked if they rent spaces in the parking deck is that considered residential or commercial. Mr. Bailey said it goes by the use. Member Templeton said he thought the surface lot should be parking for the commercial retail space. Chairperson Woolridge disagreed with Member Templeton regarding the residential spaces because Chairperson Woolridge did agreed with Member Templeton that the surface parking lot should be used by the commercial retail use and a residential could park there, if they needed to.

Discussion ensued on making a three-hour parking limit in the commercial parking lot.

Discussion ensued on the lack of long-term parking in the Downtown area.

Member Templeton said the Town talks about having a walkable community and now we are talking about more parking spaces. He said he is not that concerned for the residents because there are other options for them with alternative transportation. He said he is more concerned for having ample parking spaces for the commercial use. He said due the year-round weather being too harsh at times, there will need to be some parking spaces available for the commercial use.

Discussion ensued on a change that could make an increase in parking spaces.

Vice-Chairperson Simmons said he was concerned that there is a lot of token commercial space being built. Member Templeton talked about ways to make less token commercial space.

Member Catoe asked about the square footage inside the parking deck. Member Templeton said the square footage inside the parking deck counts as commercial square footage. He said the surface lot that is not covered and not part of the building it does not count towards commercial square footage which is a requirement in order to get the residential square footage. He noted that the ordinance is forcing the applicant into a bad design for the proposed project. Vice-Chairperson Simmons said he thought that the Planned Development process was not supposed to force the developer into anything.

Chairperson Woolridge asked the applicant if they would be open to changing their parking proposal. Mr. Githens said he would be open to that change and it is not a design change and they would be relocating 16 commercial spaces to the surface lot and the deck will solely be dedicated

for residential parking spaces. He said he wants to maintain residential spaces so there are short-term spaces for their perspective residents. He said he would be fine with this change knowing it would change their commercial calculation.

Discussion ensued on flex parking spaces for after-hours use.

Member Templeton referred to page 90 of the 2030 Boone Master Plan and talked about a rendering showing the building materials and appearance of the buildings.

Discussion ensued on the building height and the parapet.

Vice-Chairperson Simmons talked said the Boone 2030 Master Plan it is not a regulatory document but a planning document created by the Lawrence Group.

Chairperson Woolridge asked Mr. Githens if he would agree to adding ten parking spaces in the parking garage for the employees. Mr. Githens said that number seems high. Mr. Githens went over the number of employees at the complex. Mr. Githens said that five spaces sounds like a more accurate number for employees with 16 spaces dedicated to commercial and three spaces to prospective residential spaces. Mr. Githens talked more about walkability and alternative transportation being an option.

Member Vincent said a restaurant could easily take five parking spaces, if a restaurant is one of the uses. Mr. Githens said the same argument holds for residential as it does for commercial. Chairperson Woolridge talked about the architecture of the proposed project and how it could be worked out further. Mr. Bailey said that Staff would recommend that the Planning Commission make a recommendation for the applicant to work with the Town of Boone Urban Design Specialist. Mr. Bailey explained how this would be done.

Member Myers asked if the other side of the building near the creek had been rendered. Mr. Githens said no and noted what the building would be like.

Discussion ensued on the entrance of the Greenway.

Mr. Bailey noted that unless the building design is shown and deviations requested the it is subject to the appearance standards.

Member Templeton talked about the Planning Commission making recommendations that require the Community Appearance Commission review the building materials of the proposed plan.

Mr. Deal clarified that the applicant is willing to go before the Community Appearance Commission for an appearance review, if needed.

Member Catoe wanted to recommend that they consider using natural stone within the UDO guidelines.

Member Templeton wanted to recommend that they include the original clock tower in the roof design.

Member Myers wanted to recommend that the building elevation be consistent on both sides of the building.

Chairperson Woolridge began discussion on the Greenway. Mr. Deal noted that he was not for sure what the County is going to do at this time. Mr. Deal said that the applicant agreed to build the Greenway to that location, if the plan was approved.

Member Vincent asked about a proposed landscape plan. Mr. Bailey explained the UDO requirements for this type of plan.

Chairperson Woolridge talked about reviewing the West Boone Alive Plan and the Town of Boone having an old cabbage scale from the old Kraut factory, he said that there had been discussion about incorporating the cabbage scale into the re-development on this property.

Discussion ensued on building height and the relocation of the commercial space and the location of the parking deck.

Vice-Chairperson Simmons referred to the previously approved conditional district. He shared his thoughts on the building height. He said he might not have so much trouble with the proposed building height, if they did not already have a prior approval and now there are proposed changes to the project. He said he was thinking about trading off every foot of where the building goes up. He talked about re-locating the commercial space away from most of the commercial parking and accessing alongside the Poplar Grove Road to get down to the commercial retail spaces. He said he liked the gallery style that was previously approved. He said he would like for the Planning Commission to discuss it.

Member Templeton said that the commercial space will be vacant for a very long time as it was previously approved. He said this space does not have a view, it is in a curve with high speed vehicles passing by and it is not a convenient location. He said from a commercial rental standpoint locating the commercial along Water Street and Poplar Grove Road makes better sense.

Chairperson Woolridge talked about the changing of the Downtown and it doesn't have to look the way it has always looked.

Vice-Chairperson Simmons talked about his main issue with the building height. He talked about density having a connection to height. He talked about where do you want students? He talked about the various locations in the Town where student housing is. He talked about other housing solutions. He talked about density having a connection to height. He said he is concerned with housing diversity and having a mix of housing solutions in the Downtown area.

Member Templeton talked about allowing developers to exceed building height in exchange for some units designated for low income or workforce housing. He said would this project lend itself to this idea.

Member Templeton talked about creating incentives to make a project viable.

Member Long said this particular property is probably one of the most valuable properties in Downtown Boone and trying to regulate the construction costs to build housing and then to regulate the housing. He doesn't think this particular proposed project is a candidate for this idea.

Discussion ensued on regulating the rent costs.

Mr. Bailey said that the Staff has taken a look at the downtown and mixed-use and how we look at the different housing choices. He noted that the Planning Commission will be a part of the discussion this year.

Mr. Bailey said the applicant has to agree to the conditions at the Council meeting in order for them to become binding. Mr. Bailey said the Council will discuss the recommendations as well. Mr. Bailey explained the process of making a recommendation to Council.

Discussion ensued on the layout of the residential units. Mr. Bailey explained that housing that is designed with large bedrooms and small living spaces only appeals to students.

Discussion ensued on re-designing bedrooms for students and for other users.

Vice-Chairperson Simmons talked about the re-developing of the Downtown area and asked if the Planning Commission members were alright with the lack of diversity in the B-1 zoning district. He noted the recent housing study is four-years old. Mr. Bailey gave some details regarding the housing study.

Vice-Chairperson Simmons said that normally when he is preparing for the hearing cases, he reads Boone 2030 Master Plan and the 2006 Comprehensive Plan and he looks at the updates on the 2006 Comprehensive Plan. He said after he reads these associated documents, he knows what the Town's values are and what direction they want a case to go. He talked about the conflict of values of what people want in the Downtown area. He said that he agrees with the people. He talked about the 2006 Comprehensive Plan needing an update.

Vice-Chairperson Simmons asked Staff if a Downtown area plan was on their agenda. Mr. Bailey said yes and there would be discussion on Wellness District and zoning standards, mixed-use in general and parking in general and the Downtown area. These agenda items will be going on simultaneously because they all impact each other.

Chairperson Woolridge said it is not all the developer's responsibility for a proposed project, it is the result of policy that the Town puts into place.

Discussion ensued on future housing as a result of the university's growth and the growth of the Downtown area with consideration to density. Member Templeton said there is not a lot of options to handle the future growth.

Member Templeton said he thinks what the applicant is proposing is better for the community overall.

Discussion ensued on the appropriate size of the signage and the lighting of it for the proposed project. Mr. Bailey helped explained what is being proposed in the applicant's information regarding signage.

Mr. Githens asked the Staff to go to the following website www.stationatfive.com. He talked about the monument sign shown in this building. He said the size of this sign is roughly 40 square feet. He said he is proposing to replicate this sign for the Rivers Walk project.

First Motion and Vote:
Member Long made the motion, seconded by Member Tate that the proposed amendment to the Town's zoning map is consistent with the Towns comprehensive plan and other applicable plans of the Town which relate to this application because the said plan development is a higher overall quality development than the previously approved conditional district development because the increase in building height makes it a more viable project and allows elevator service to all residents and has less construction impact on Kraut creek, has better storm water management design and proper rooftop screening for mechanical equipment. The commercial space is more attractive and flexible in size and is in a more concentrated location bordering Water Street. It is more likely to be successful as commercial space than the previous commercial space plan. The

applicant's willingness to construct the Greenway along the property and Kraut Creek will be a benefit to all the residents of Boone and those visiting the Downtown area. The redistribution of commercial parking to the surface lot allows for more convenient parking for the commercial retail space. In regards to architecture, the applicant is willing to work with the Community Appearance Commission which will result in an architectural design that is harmonious with the Downtown area and based on more community consensus.

Vote:

Aye – 8 (Catoe, Dineen, Myers, Long, Tate, Templeton, Vincent, Woolridge)
Nay – 1 (Simmons)

The motion passed.

Second Motion and Vote:
Chairperson Woolridge made a motion, seconded by Member Long that the Planning Commission recommend approval based on the previously approved plan and the proposed plan because it will create a higher quality development and assure a cohesive design in the Downtown area and the surrounding properties for the following reasons which include the five Staff recommendations:

1. Where there is a conflict between the application information and the plans (site plans bearing a received date of March 25th and architectural plans bearing a received date of March 28, 2016), the plans shall control. Insignificant deviations may be permitted to comply with the requirements of the UDO.
2. Any commitments and representations concerning the proposed project made by the applicant or its (his or her) representatives at the public hearing shall also become a condition of the permit, and a basis for a stop work order and/or permit revocation if violated.
3. Final plans shall be submitted that are in compliance with the provisions of the UDO and other provisions of the Town Code.
4. The Town of Boone will be given the necessary easements for public sidewalks which leave existing street right-of-way.
5. All driveway permits shall be obtained prior to the issuance of a Zoning Permit.
6. The surface lot in the plan be used for non-employee commercial parking and a minimum of five parking spaces inside the parking deck be dedicated towards commercial parking.
7. The applicant will work with the Community Appearance Commission to develop the final appearance for the building based on the current B-1 zoning standards.
8. The applicant agreed to re-incorporate the clock tower into the building design.
9. The applicant agreed to construct a paved eight-foot wide Greenway to the counties property line.
10. The applicant is committed to "Greenway Connection to Howard Street drawing" submitted to the Planning Commission on April 11, 2016.

Vote:

Aye – 8 (Catoe, Dineen, Myers, Long, Tate, Templeton, Vincent, Woolridge)
Nay – 1 (Simmons)

The motion passed.

Vice-Chairperson Simmons talked about his concerns for this proposed project. He said his reservations for the proposed project have to do with the building height in the context of the B-1 zoning district. He talked about the building height in the B-1 zoning compared to the previous approval for building height based on the variance that was granted. He voiced his other concerns regarding the parking reductions, lack of diversity in the housing configuration from the previous approval to the current proposal of around 60 percent of the project going to four bedrooms to a unit. He said this is a concern for him, when he thinks about developing the infill projects around Town. He said there are many improvements in the proposed project that are very appealing to him such as the greenway. He said he would rely on the Community Appearance Commission to review the Downtown B-1 architectural standards for the proposed project.

Vice-Chairperson Simmons referred to page eight of the Town's 2006 Comprehensive Plan and he read the section regarding the Downtown area. He also pointed out in the Downtown section of the 2006 Comprehensive Plan that this plan and the 2030 Master Plan are the controlling documents. He said that it will be up to Council to decide if it is a fair trade off between the conditional district approval and the proposed Planned Development plan for this project.

OTHER MATTERS BY BOARD MEMBERS OR STAFF

There were no other matters discussed at this meeting.

ADJOURNMENT

Member Tate made a motion to adjourn the meeting at 9:15 p.m., seconded by Member Vincent.

Vote:

Aye – All
Nay – None

The motion passed.

_____ _____

Chairperson, Eric Woolridge **Board Secretary, Marlene Crosby**